



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## THE ENGLISH CENSUS OF 1921

---

Only the preliminary results of the English census of 1921 have as yet been published, but the brief report, which has been issued as a White Paper,<sup>1</sup> is a document of unusual interest for many reasons. The records of this recent census correspond in some measure for Americans with the results of our census of 1870. "The great gulf of the war" lies between the English census of 1911 and the present one, as the great rebellion and the emancipation of the slaves lay for us between the censuses of 1860 and 1870.

The English Registrar-General points out that the English census of 1921 may be regarded (1) as a vestigial record of the passage of the greatest war that England has ever known and (2) as a source of enlightenment upon the many problems that the war has bequeathed to that country. "Never before," says the explanatory handbook<sup>2</sup> issued by the census authorities,

<sup>1</sup> Census of England and Wales, 1921. *Preliminary Report* including tables of the population enumerated in England and Wales (administrative and parliamentary areas) and in Scotland, the Isle of Man, and the Channel Islands on 19-20th June, 1921, together with the population recently enumerated of certain other parts of the British Empire. London, 1921, Cmd. 1485, pp. xvii+64.

<sup>2</sup> *The Coming Census. Why It Is Taken, How It Is Taken, and How to Fill up the Census Schedule* (prepared with the authority of the Registrar-General and containing a copy of the official form of schedule), London, 1921, C. 6, pp. 24.

This little pamphlet contains a popular and admirably lucid statement of the purposes and methods of the census. Thus it is explained that "as the object of the Census is figures, it is not concerned with the private lives or actions of the individuals counted, and only asks them questions as to their personal characteristics in order that they may be properly counted and assigned to the particular groups of the population in which they ought to be reckoned. For example, the Census needs to know that Mr. William Smith is a married man aged 49, *not* because the State proposes to interest itself in Mr. Smith's private life or actions, but solely in order that the number of married men in the population and the number of men aged 49 in the population may be correctly counted.

"This information as to the number and composition of our population is not asked for to gratify curiosity or merely to add to the sum-total of human knowledge. The cost of census-taking is far too great to be incurred solely to provide interesting facts. The real necessity for the Census is that it is the only possible method of finding out from time to time what is the true condition, social and economic, of the people; and that this knowledge is indispensable not only to enable the people to govern itself and to carry on its national work, but also as a starting point and foundation for all efforts and plans for the betterment of social and national conditions" (p. 1).

"has there been such need for the Census as that which the War has created. Since the last Census the War has cut clean across every branch of our national life; it has broken up and redistributed local populations; it has violently upset all birth-rates, marriage-rates and death-rates; it has altered the whole occupational and industrial configuration of the country, and completely changed many of the customs, habits and conditions of the people. There is hardly a single question upon which we can look back to the results of the last Census for guidance, so great having been the break between that time and this."

The published results of the census as yet relate only to the number and sex of the population and are at present only provisional. But they indicate in broad outlines the effect of the war upon the English population. The population returned is 37,885,242, and the intercensal increase in population is the smallest recorded for more than a century. The increase is only "about one-half the increase in the preceding intercensal period; it is less than any corresponding figure since 1811, while proportionately it is far lower than any hitherto recorded."

An analysis of the intercensal movements for the last half-century is presented in the following table.<sup>1</sup>

Intercensal Period	Intercensal Increase of Population	Births Registered in England and Wales	Deaths Registered in England and Wales	Excess of Births over Deaths	Loss Representing Balance of Outward over Inward Passenger Movement
1871-81.....	3,262,173	8,604,710	5,178,230	3,426,480	164,307
1881-91.....	3,028,086	8,893,920	5,264,445	3,629,475	601,389
1891-1901.....	3,525,318	9,157,181	5,503,525	3,593,656	68,338
1901-11.....	3,542,649	9,290,633	5,245,765	4,044,868	502,219
1911-21.....	1,814,750	8,275,400	5,266,900	3,008,500	1,193,750*

\*Including the deaths of non-civilians of England and Wales which occurred outside the United Kingdom. (Strictly speaking, members of the forces ceased to be part of the population for census purposes when they left the country. The deaths of non-civilians belonging to England and Wales which occurred at the various theaters of war, 1914-20, is given as 569,000, and the non-civilian deaths in England and Wales during that period as 67,870, or a total of 627,870 non-civilian deaths. This total includes the "missing, presumed dead" (*Preliminary Report*, p. ix, Table B, footnote). This total would make the direct war losses approximately 166 per 10,000 of the population, as returned two and a half years after the armistice.)

<sup>1</sup> *Preliminary Report*, Cmd. 1485, p. ix, Table A.

The Registrar-General notes that, as regards the so-called natural increase of population, that is, the excess of births over deaths, the movement was normal until 1914; but thereafter the continuity ceased, and the changes became great and unpredictable. It is noted that the fall in the birth-rate from 1915 to 1918 was "much heavier than anything previously experienced, the numbers being from 20 to 25 per cent below what might have been expected in normal circumstances." After the armistice very large increases in the birth-rate were recorded, and the number of births in 1920 was greater than in any other year in the preceding decade; but the tremendous losses of the war years could not be quickly overbalanced.

Another of the direct legacies of the war noted in the preliminary census report is the greater excess of the female over the male population. This excess, which has been a feature of all English returns since the first enumeration in 1801, was 1,179,276 when the census of 1911 was taken, and has now been increased to 1,720,802; and the preponderance of females remains greatest in the urban districts. The proportion of females to 1,000 males at the two census periods was as follows:

	1911	1921
England and Wales* . . . . .	1,068	1,095
All urban districts . . . . .	1,087	1,114
All rural districts . . . . .	998	1,025

\* Compiled from Table E, Cmd. 1485, p. xvii.

Another characteristic of the population that appears from these preliminary figures is the continuing tendency toward an increase in the urban at the expense of the rural districts. The heralded movement "back to the land," which many people hoped would follow the war, has not occurred; and clerks and counter-jumpers are still clerks and counter-jumpers and not farmers. The per cent distribution of the population classified by urban and rural residence is given<sup>1</sup> on page 830 for the last three census periods.

It has already been pointed out that the disturbing effects of the war, shown statistically in the census returns, make this

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*

Thirteenth English Census in some respects like the census of the United States which was taken in 1870 and which told the story of our Great Conflict. It is common for Europe in these days to speak lightly of American losses in the world-war. But Europe forgets, as we do not, that we had in the last generation a war of staggering losses all our own, the chronicles of which are seldom read and little understood abroad.

		1901	1911	1921
Percentage of total population . . . . .	{ Urban	77.0	78.1	79.3
	{ Rural	23.0	21.9	20.7
Increase in population in the areas as constituted at the date of each census over the population of the same areas at the previous census . . . . .	{ Urban	15.2	11.1	5.2
	{ Rural	2.9	10.2	4.3

General Francis A. Walker, in his report as superintendent of the United States census of 1870, noted his own disappointment and the disappointment of the country at finding the population returned as approximately 38,000,000, when 41,000,000 had been hoped for by those who "took counsel rather of their patriotism than of their judgment."<sup>1</sup> General Walker attributed the loss of the additional 3,000,000 population which had been expected, to what he called "the notorious and palpable effects of the war." Our war losses as assessed by General Walker are of interest in comparison with the English figures. General Walker thought 500,000 would "surely be a moderate estimate for the direct losses among the Union armies," and he thought it "difficult to see how anyone could, upon reflection, place the losses of the confederate armies at less than 350,000 men. We reach, therefore," he said, "the total result of a direct loss to the male population of the country of not less than 850,000. Popular opinion," he added, "would undoubtedly place this total much higher," and, in such a matter, he thought that popular judgments were "quite as likely to be as correct as judgments formed from the contemplation of statistical data necessarily partial and incomplete."

<sup>1</sup> *Ninth Census of the United States*, "The Statistics of the Population of the United States," Vol. I, 1870, p. xviii.

Dr. Walker's estimate would make the direct war losses approximately 224 per ten thousand of the population as returned by the census almost five years after its close.<sup>1</sup> In addition to the direct losses through deaths from wounds and disease, Dr. Walker noted the indirect losses of the war in the check given to the increase of the native population through the withdrawal into our opposing armies of so large a proportion of "the total male population of the ages when marriages are formed and children begotten." He notes also the loss to population through the check given to immigration and the loss due to the retardation of increase in the colored population.<sup>2</sup>

Surveying the war period, Dr. Walker wrote, somewhat grandiloquently perhaps but no doubt correctly voicing the opinion of that time, "Indeed under such tremendous losses as the country has sustained, it is wholly wonderful that it [the national rate of progress] should have held its own, and even made a positive gain in ten years of more than seven millions. Nothing but the irresistible vigor of our stock, the noble opportunities afforded by our expanding territory and the provocatives of our bracing air and generous diet, would have sufficed to repair such losses and make such gains."

<sup>1</sup> Later estimates of Civil War losses were smaller than General Walker's. See, for example, Rhodes, *History of the United States*, V (1864-66), 187, in which the Union losses are put at 359,528 dead and the Confederate losses at 258,000 dead, a total of 617,528 for the whole country. In proportion to the population of 1870, the losses as quoted would be approximately 163 per 10,000 population. With proper allowances for certain differences as regards the population figure used, which was for a longer period after the close of the war than that used for England, it seems safe to say that our Civil War losses were certainly not below the English losses in the Great War.

<sup>2</sup> On this point the census report notes that an increase of approximately one million in the colored population was expected whereas the census revealed the true increase as 438,179. This decrease was also a result of the war, for the freedmen, "drawn largely from the plantations where their increase was natural, rapid, and sure, to cities and camps, where want, vice, and pestilence made short work of the multitudes hastily gathered, inadequately provided for, and left for the first time to their own control, while so much of the impulse to procreation as depended on the profits of slave breeding was withdrawn by the abolition of chattelism, it is only to be wondered at that the colored people of the South have held their own in the ten years since 1860" (p. xviii).

It is, however, the purpose of this discussion to note certain changes in English census methods rather than to analyze the population returns. In fact, the latter task cannot properly be undertaken with only the preliminary figures available.

The census of 1921 marks an important departure from precedent. It is the first census to be taken under the Census Act of 1920,<sup>1</sup> which, unlike all previous English census acts, is not limited to the taking of a single census but is a perpetual act applying to all future censuses. New legislation will not be necessary when another census is to be taken. Under the provisions of this act, an Order in Council may direct the taking of a census; and it is another new feature of the act that a quinquennial census may be ordered.<sup>2</sup> As in the past, the census will be under the direction of the Registrar-General, whose office is now under the Ministry of Health. A further innovation lies in the provision (section 6) which enables a local authority, upon application to the Ministry of Health, to arrange for the taking of a special local census if this appears to be expedient "for the purpose of facilitating the due performance

<sup>1</sup> 10 & 11 George V, chap. 41, "An Act to make provision for the taking from time to time of a Census for Great Britain or any area therein and for otherwise obtaining Statistical Information with respect to the Population of Great Britain" (August 16, 1920).

<sup>2</sup> The fact that the census is now under the Ministry of Health may have influenced the provision for a quinquennial census. On the subject of the short-comings of a decennial census, the parliamentary secretary of the Ministry of Health, when the Census Bill was before Parliament, said: "We find by experience that the information available to the country, and available to the Government, towards the end of the decennial period is very inaccurate. This vitiates all our health and mortality figures. In order that they may be of any value we must be able to give those figures in terms of percentages. It is of no value to know the number of people who die of any particular disease in any area, unless we give the percentage they represent of the population as a whole, and therefore it is absolutely essential that our main, fundamental figures of the population should be accurate. We find by experience that ten years is too long an interval. I could quote . . . cases where the population of large centres have been either over-estimated or under-estimated to the extent, in some cases, of 25 per cent., showing how inaccurate some of the vital statistics must be on which we have been dependent in the past. A large number of other countries have quinquennial instead of decennial censuses—France, Germany, Japan, New Zealand, three of the Provinces of Canada, and other countries."—40 H. L. Deb. 5 s., col. 577 (June 10, 1920).

by the local authority of its statutory duties.” The expenses of such a local census including the expense of publishing the reports or returns must be borne by the local authority.

The census act also provides, as regards the schedule, that no particulars shall be required other than particulars respecting such matters as are mentioned in the schedule to the act. These are: (1) names, sex, age; (2) occupation, profession, trade, or employment; (3) nationality, birthplace, race, language; (4) place of abode and character of dwelling; (5) condition as to marriage, relation to head of family, issue born in marriage; (6) any other matters with respect to which it is desirable to obtain statistical information with a view to ascertaining the social or civil condition of the population.

The expenses for the taking of the first census under the new act would, it was estimated, amount to £500,000. The cost of the 1911 census had been only £196,001.<sup>1</sup> The estimated increase in cost was charged to the rise in salaries and materials. It was pointed out that if, in future, censuses were taken at intervals of less than a decade, the cost would probably be substantially reduced.

As in preceding English census enumerations, the 1921 census schedules were filled in by householders instead of, as in America, by special census enumerators. The special committee of the Royal Statistical Society, which was appointed, with Professor Bowley as chairman, to consider proposals for improvements in the census of 1921, had recommended<sup>2</sup> a change to the American system on the ground that the use of special enumerators would add considerably to the accuracy of the returns and would make more practicable the inclusion of certain additional items on the census schedule.

Again, following the practice of earlier English censuses, the *de facto* population was obtained in contrast to our *de jure* enumeration. On this point Professor Bowley's committee had recommended the securing of the *de facto* population in order

<sup>1</sup> *Census (Expenses) Memorandum on Financial Resolution*, Cmd. 869, 1920.

<sup>2</sup> “Report on the Census,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, LXXXIII (January, 1920), 134.



to preserve the continuity of the census statistics. The desirability of accompanying the *de facto* enumeration by a *de jure* tabulation was pointed out. The committee suggested that the schedule might be amended to provide, for visitors, a statement as to their usual place of residence. In tabulating the returns the number of visitors or persons having a more permanent residence elsewhere could be subtracted from the returns for the places where they were enumerated and added to the districts where they usually resided.<sup>1</sup> This method of securing both a *de facto* and a *de jure* enumeration would avoid our American difficulties of omissions and double enumerations.

Unfortunately, the British coal strike and the threatened strike of railway and transport workers led to an eleventh-hour postponement of the census from April 24, 1921, the date origi-

<sup>1</sup> In discussing this subject Professor Bowley's committee said: "The fact that in fixing the date of the Census a night is chosen on which it is presumed that the minimum number of persons will be away from their own homes shows that the aim of those responsible for the *de facto* censuses in the past has been to approximate them as nearly as possible to *de jure* enumeration. The latter therefore have been tacitly acknowledged to form the ideal method of presenting the Census results, though practical considerations of accuracy and convenience might render that ideal difficult or impossible of attainment. It is difficult, indeed, to select any Census tabulation which would not more appropriately refer to the residents of each area than to its chance occupants on a given night, if their number could be stated with equal accuracy. For all such questions as the apportionment of electoral areas, municipal status, equalization of rates, housing and so forth the *de jure* population is evidently the appropriate measure, and the *de facto* is only tolerable as a substitute in so far as it approximates to the *de jure*. All tables, moreover, relating to the social conditions of the various areas would be more informative if they referred to the inhabitants of each area. Evidence of this will be found in the fact that we naturally think and speak of them as doing so. To take, for instance, occupation—there is much to be said against a system under which a man working as a miner in Glamorgan may be recorded as a coal miner in London. And the same may be said of industry, birth-place, fertility, overcrowding and probably any other subject dealt with. Lastly, it may be mentioned that the *de jure* rather than the *de facto* population is already required for the purposes of vital statistics. From 1911 onwards the Registrar-General has tabulated the *de jure* births and deaths for each administrative area, transferring deaths of and births to non-residents to their areas of residence, so it is evident that for the preparation of birth- and death-rates the population should be similarly treated, if this can be done with sufficient accuracy."—"Report on the Census," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, LXXXIII (January, 1920), 136.

nally set, to June 19, 1921. The new date was close enough to the summer holiday period to show clearly one of the disadvantages of enumerating the *de facto* population. The preliminary census report notes that the holiday movement of June, 1921, was accelerated by a period of fine weather and was responsible for an artificial increase in the population of the more popular summer resorts. Thus of the twenty large towns in which the recorded increase in population between 1911 and 1921 was more than 10 per cent, at the top stand two popular holiday resorts—Blackpool with an increase of 64 per cent and Southend-on-Sea with an increase of 54 per cent. The census estimate is that the holiday movement affected from one-half to three-fourths of 1 per cent of population; but in particular areas, of course, the numbers affected would be much greater.

The English census schedule of 1921 is of interest both for the withdrawals and the additions to the list of particulars required. In America we are accustomed to having questions pop on and off the census schedule, but the English take the withdrawals seriously. The Registrar-General notes in his introduction to the *Preliminary Report* that it is the first time in the modern history of census-taking in England "that any enquiry once introduced into the schedule has been omitted therefrom on a subsequent occasion. The fact is indicative of a stage at which the limits of expansion have been approximately reached."<sup>1</sup> The "limits of expansion" which restrict the English schedule to some thirteen inquiries are interesting in comparison with the expanding capacity of our large schedules including twenty-nine inquiries in 1920 and thirty-two inquiries in 1910.

The items omitted from the English schedule were the "infirmities" inquiry which asked whether any member of the household was blind, deaf, insane, or feeble-minded; and the "fertility" inquiry which was new in 1911 and which called for

<sup>1</sup> *The Coming Census*, pamphlet, *op. cit.*, explains that "The enquiries contained in the Census Schedule for 1921 are those which after careful sifting and selection have been decided to be the most valuable and necessary for public purposes; and it may be taken for granted that the greatest care has been exercised to avoid burdening the community with any enquiry which has not appeared to be fully justified by its value to the community."

particulars as to the duration of existing marriages and the number of children born of such marriages. The "infirmities" inquiry was dropped, as all parts of it have finally been dropped from our own schedule, because, in the words of the Registrar-General, "of the generally recognized fact that reliable information upon these subjects cannot be expected in returns made by or on behalf of the individuals afflicted." As regards the fertility inquiry it was dropped, "notwithstanding its importance," because "of the long range covered by the 1911 enquiry and of the fact that the wealth of material which it provided had not been completely exhausted."

The additions to the schedule are more interesting than the withdrawals. The first of these was an inquiry as to orphanhood for children under fifteen, the instructions being to write "Both alive," if both parents were alive; "Father dead," "Mother dead" or "Both dead," if one or both parents were dead. The Census handbook, which explains the schedule, points out that accurate information as to the number of orphans has become necessary as a result of the war and explains that the inquiry was added to the schedule "in order that proper attention may be given to the condition of orphans."<sup>1</sup>

Another addition to the schedule was an inquiry as to "Place of Work" accompanying the inquiries as to occupation and employment. The census instructions were to "Give the address of each person's place of work. For a person with no regular place of work write 'No fixed place.' If the work is carried on mainly at home, write 'At home.'" No entry was required for any person who was "retired or out of work." This addition was one of those suggested by Professor Bowley's committee, and the census authorities explain that it has been

rendered specially necessary by the important problems of housing and transport. The Census shows us how many people *live* in any particular district; and this new question will tell us where those people *work*. We shall then know the daily tide of movement between people's homes and their places of work, its direction, range and volume.

This is obviously vital for the purpose of supplementing the transport facilities (bus, tram or train) for the working public. It is also necessary

<sup>1</sup> *The Coming Census*, p. 4.

for housing purposes. In determining the site of new housing accommodation it is essential to know what locality is most conveniently situated so as to enable the tenants to get to their work. It will be absolutely necessary to have this kind of information in order to arrange for houses to be built where they are most needed. Again, when the question arises of establishing continuation schools, it will be important for local authorities to know, not only where the people who have to be provided for live, but also where they work, since it may be more convenient to them to have their continuation school in the neighborhood of their workplace than in the neighborhood of their residence.<sup>1</sup>

The returns to this question have inevitably given rise to some new and interesting problems of tabulation. According to the Registrar-General, substantial administrative machinery had to be devised "to give statistical effect to the new place of work enquiry. While the scheme of enumeration itself ensures that the places of *residence* of the population on the Census night are automatically allotted to the several local sub-divisions of the country (boroughs, urban or rural districts, wards, and civil parishes, etc.), in which they are situated, no statistical expression could, of course, be given to the place of work addresses until a similar allocation has been made and the local sub-division accurately identified in the case of each address."

Officers in charge of the enumeration, though familiar enough with their own districts, were not, of course, sufficiently informed about places in other sections to enable them correctly to assign all place of work addresses entered in their schedules. Further, the census authorities held the opinion that not without enormous expense, if at all, would it have been possible "to have collected and trained a staff at headquarters which would have been competent to identify in all cases the local areas within the boundaries of which every place of work throughout the country was situated." A supplementary postcard census was therefore taken at a later date according to the following method of procedure:

The local Registrar receiving the returns from Enumerators was required to identify and code the local area of each place-of-work address within the district for which he was responsible. But with regard to other place-of-work addresses, it was arranged that a simple postcard form should

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 6.

be written bearing the address of the place of work and the reference number of the Census Schedule upon which it was entered; and an arrangement was made with the General Post Office whereby these postcards when posted were delivered to the Registrar for the locality in which the place-of-work address was situated. This Registrar, having expert and precise knowledge of the boundaries and local sub-divisions in his own district was, of course, competent to make an accurate assignment of the address of each postcard received by him; and it was arranged that the Registrars receiving such postcards should code them and transmit them to headquarters. On receipt at headquarters the postcards thus coded were to be sorted back according to the districts whence they originated with a view to their ultimate association with the Schedules to which they respectively relate. This procedure appeared to offer the only means whereby full advantage could be derived from the invaluable material afforded by the place-of-work enquiry. It has involved, of course, large-scale operations in connection of the many millions of place-of-work addresses; and detailed preparations have had to be made to provide for the various contingencies which were bound to arise.

It is of interest that Professor Bowley's committee also recommended as a further addition to the inquiries relating to occupation and employment, a question as to unemployment. Their recommendation was, that, "for each person returned as occupied who was not actually occupied at all during the week previous to the Sunday of the Census, the letter N should be written, or in case of non-occupation through sickness or accident, the letter S, or in case of persons on holiday, the letter H."<sup>1</sup> This suggestion is interesting in view of our singularly unsuccessful experience in America with this question, which appeared on our census schedules in 1880, 1890, 1900, and 1910. The returns were not tabulated in 1880 nor in 1910, and the results for 1890 and 1900 were not considered valuable enough to lead to the retention of the inquiry in 1920.

An entirely new question in census experience either in England or the United States is the inquiry made only in respect of married men, widowers, and widows which asks for the "number of ages of all living children and stepchildren under sixteen years of age" whether residing with the householder or not. That is, returns to this question will make available for the first

<sup>1</sup> *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, LXXXIII, 137.

time statistics of the number and age distribution of the dependent children of every family. The census authorities explain that these returns "will be of great value in connection with questions relating to the amount of dependency upon various classes of men and women and various occupations or industries as well as for the amendment of any arrangements such as those relating to Workmen's Compensation."

A final interesting change in the English schedule is an alteration in an old inquiry first used in the schedule of 1891—an inquiry which has produced immensely valuable social returns in the past with which we, in America, have unfortunately nothing to compare. This is the inquiry relating to the number of rooms occupied by each householder. In 1911, at the bottom of each family schedule was the following: "To be filled up by or on behalf of the Head of Family or other person in occupation, or in charge of, this dwelling. Write below the number of rooms in this dwelling (House, Tenement or Apartment). Count the kitchen as a room but do not count scullery, landing, lobby, closet, bathroom; nor warehouse, office, shop."

This was altered in 1921 and at the bottom of each householder's schedule the following was inserted to be filled in by the enumerator or, according to English practice, by the person collecting the schedules:

Males——Females——Persons——Rooms.

It is to be hoped that the change in the manner of making this inquiry will in no way invalidate for comparative purpose the valuable results hitherto obtained from this inquiry, the returns to which have been published in those interesting volumes on *Tenements* issued by the English census and which furnish the basis for the overcrowding statistics for all English cities and towns. This inquiry is unquestionably so much more valuable than some of the inquiries on our own schedule that it remains difficult to understand why in the face of the exceedingly useful results obtained with this question on the English schedule it should remain wanting on our own.

The results of the new census when finally published should therefore provide some material of great interest in the field of social statistics in the returns from (1) the "orphan" question, (2) the "place of work" question, (3) the "dependent children" question, (4) the substitution of the enumerator's for the householder's return as to the number of rooms in each occupied dwelling.

It is of interest that the practical social uses of the census are emphasized by the census authorities. This periodical test examination of the condition of the people is said to be "necessary as the basis of all plans for improvement and reform. The habits, customs, conditions and aims of the people are always slowly changing. The direction and extent of these drifts or changes" can be properly understood only through the census returns; and without a knowledge of these returns "the wisest and most enthusiastic efforts for the betterment of social conditions may be wholly wasted."<sup>1</sup>

EDITH ABBOTT

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

<sup>1</sup> *The Coming Census*, p. 2.